*The Rising Cost of U.S. Militarism, P. 2*

**How Much of A Dove Is Humphrey's George Ball When Words Like These Infuriated Him?**

**"It is unthinkable, incredible, when you think of the sufferings of these [Vietnamese] people. That is why I am saying that the necessary first steps should be taken and must be taken—and see what will happen afterwards. I am convinced—I was convinced during the last three years and I am convinced now—that once this essential first step [an end of the bombing of the North] is taken, very meaningful talks will take place leading towards a peaceful settlement of the problem."**

*—UN Secretary General U Thant to the press Sept. 23.*

# I. F. Stone's Weekly

*Now Published Bi-Weekly*

VOL. XVI, NO. 20 OCTOBER 7, 1968 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

# Why Hubert Is As Tricky As Dicky

It is a delusion to believe that Humphrey is not saying what we want him to say on Vietnam because he is afraid of Johnson. Humphrey's whole record, not just as an anti-Communist on the home front, but on Southeast Asia leaves little reason to believe that he would have a different position on the Vietnam war even if freed from Johnson's influence. Humphrey's enthusiasm for American intervention in Southeast Asia goes back to 1950 when he welcomed Truman's decision to give financial aid to the French and to their puppet Emperor, Bao Dai. When the French were criticized for not sending troops to Korea, Humphrey defended them on the ground that they were already "fighting for freedom in Indochina." Humphrey was second only to Nixon in readiness for U.S. involvement. When Nixon proposed sending American troops into Indochina before the Geneva conference in 1954, Humphrey was not prepared to go that far, though he told the Senate on April 19 of that year he thought Nixon's famous off-the-record speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors was "very responsible, considered, mature and intelligent." The *entente cordiale* between them far antedates the current campaign, which is being fought like a gentlemanly boxing match.

### Even Rightists Don't Question His Record

Humphrey *is* a prisoner of the Johnson Administration and perhaps even more so of the labor movement, his only organized support outside the party machines. George Meany is if anything even more hawkish on the war than Johnson, as Meany was more hawkish than Eisenhower. Humphrey would take all the enthusiasm out of Meany's support if he were to shift over on Vietnam. But the essential reason that Humphrey holds back is that he has always believed in the war, and in the necessity of creating a bulwark in Vietnam against Communist expansion into Southeast Asia. It is indicative that the highly unfair and twisted attack made on him by Allan Ryskind of *Human Events,* the organ of the far rightists, in a newly published book, "Hubert", is unable to pin on him any dove-like statement about the Indochina war. "This is our great adventure," Humphrey declared expansively in a talk less than a year ago to the U.S. Embassy staff in Saigon, "and a wonderful one it is." No one has been more Gung Ho about this war than Hubert Humphrey. Eisenhower and Kennedy as well as Johnson had his support as the escalation continued and the U.S. stakes grew.

### Unworthy To Be Chief Justice

**Those of us who lived through the witch hunt years saw the nomination of Owen Lattimore's defender, Abe Fortas, to be Chief Justice, as a vindication, an immensely satisfying symbolism. But the realities uncovered in the fight against him left a bad taste. His enemies did him honor but the flaw was in a love of power and money. Fortas could have insisted after his elevation to the bench that a self-respecting concern for the separation of powers forbade him any longer to act as Lyndon Johnson's private counsel and telephone fixer. The worst blot was the American University affair, when his former law partner Paul Porter panhandled $30,000 from five former clients to pay Fortas $30,000 for a series of summer seminars. One of the donors has a son whose appeal from a fraud conviction may soon reach the Supreme Court. Why as wealthy a man as Fortas needed the fee passes understanding, as does Porter's insensitivity.**

The Salt Lake City speech has to be read against this consistent record. Its major disappointment, from the standpoint of the peace movement, does not lie in Humphrey's tricky position on the bombing halt: the fact that like Johnson he links it to reciprocal concessions and goes further than Johnson has in explicitly stating that the bombing would be resumed if we were dissatisfied with the other side's conduct ("bad faith"). This is not unconditional cessation. More important is that Humphrey shows no readiness whatsoever for any political compromise in the peace negotiations themselves. Essentially he, like Johnson and Thieu, call on the other side to lay down its arms and accept "free elections" under South Vietnam's rigged Constitution. Humphrey in no way departs from the clichés of Johnson and Rusk: the view of the war as purely an aggression from the North; the pretense that land reform is going on when South Vietnam's oligarchic legislature, representative of the landlord class and not the peasantry, has already overwhelmingly rejected it; and the old will-of-the-wisp — that the South Vietnamese army will soon be able to take over the main burden of the war. Without a fresh view of the past and the present, the way cannot be cleared for a political settlement and a genuinely representative government in South Vietnam. This is what Johnson does not want and there is no reason to believe

*(Continued on Page Four)*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

**We Need A New Organization To Defend America and the Dollar Against Militarism**

# The Pentagon Gets the Biggest Budget in Our History But It's Not Enough

Some permanent organization is needed to protect the United States from the mounting costs of militarism and the military-industrial complex. Perhaps it ought to be called a Washington-Eisenhower Watchdog Society, from the names of the two great soldier Presidents who warned the country against these dangers. The fight ought not to be left to unorganized last-gasp efforts like those marshalled in the Senate last week by Cooper of Kentucky against the anti-missile and Clark of Pennsylvania for an $8 billion cut in the new military budget. These evils will destroy the dollar and undermine free government.

## A New Step-Up In The World Arms Race

The two-day debate in the Senate, more than half of it in secret session, signals the beginning of a new stepup in the arms race. In some ways the most alarming speech was that made by the chief defender of the new military budget, Russell of Georgia. He admitted he was presenting "the largest appropriation bill in American history", just short of $72 billions, and that actual military costs during the 1969 fiscal year would be just short of $80 billions. But Russell insisted that substantial increases would be necessary to support the war and "honor our commitments abroad."

If the war ends, Russell indicates, we are going to be pressed hard to divert Vietnam funds to "modernizing" and replenishing our tanks, missiles and bombers. Russell gave some figures on the fantastic rise in the costs of maintaining our armed forces on the scale to which they have become accustomed. A medium bomber in World War II cost less than $250,000; the latest, the RS-71, costs 100 times as much or almost $25,000,000. The M-16 costs 5 times what the M-1 did in 1946.

Clark, in a magnificent speech, gave some striking details on what military costs were doing to poverty programs in his own state. He said the so-called defense bill was really a bill to maintain "an offensive capacity as the policeman of the world." He said the inflation it was causing was "taking money out of the hides" of the poor and aged and all who live on fixed incomes. And he put into the *Record* (S11706, Oct. 1) an extraordinary issue of *Congressional Quarterly* (Sept. 20) summarizing a furious debate between Secretary Clifford and anonymous Pentagon rebels over military waste. But all his cost-cutting amendments were voted down.

### More Power For The Military Monster?

**As Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara often showed himself surprisingly obtuse. He never seemed really to grasp the dangers of the military mind and the military institution. His Montreal speech, for all its liberal veneer, proposed to extend the power of the military bureaucracy over youth and over our society in the name of social betterment. Secretary Clifford carried on the same theme in his Sept. 26 address to the National Security Industrial Association—the heart, as he admitted, of the military-industrial complex. Clifford was smug and superficial in declaring that the dangers embodied in the complex had been avoided. He was downright alarming when he proposed that our "military-industrial team" turn its "unique resources" to finding the answers "to complex domestic problems as it has found the answers to complex weapons systems." Behind the veil of secrecy, this team has made some stupendously wrong decisions, as in Vietnam. Its motives are careerism, profit and capacity for destruction, working within an institutional framework which is authoritarian and secretive. Were they to run the country socially, it would be a totalitarian state. To say, as Clifford does, that "the unity of America" must be one of their prime concerns is to invite Big Brotherism.**

Despite these stupendous expenditures, Cooper failed by a vote of 45 to 25 to block a huge new item, an anti-missile defense, billed as just a little $5 billion one against China, but which will eventually grow into one costing $40 to $70 billions against the Soviet Union, and be worthless — as McNamara warned — when it's finished. It will be like playing poker, Hart of Michigan declared, with a worthless hand. He might have added it will be the most costly bluff in human history. Cooper's most telling quotation in the debate was this —

**This concept of a missile attack originating in China any time in the near future seems to me to be very remote. The Chinese are not completely crazy; they are not going to attack us with 4 or 5 missiles [all they may have by the mid-70s] when they know we have the capability of virtually destroying their entire country . . . I don't like people to think that I am being kidded by this talk of a defense against a Chinese nuclear attack.**

That was Russell himself talking at the anti-missile hearings. He wants a big anti-missile program against the Russians. The Chinese may not be crazy. But are we entirely sane?


**OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULATION**

(Act of October 23, 1962; Section 4369, Title 39, United States Code)

1. Date of Filing Oct. 1, 1968.
2. Title of Publication: I. F. Stone's Weekly.
3. Frequency of issue: Every other week; not published in August.
4. Location of known office of publication: 5618 Nebraska Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20015.
5. *Location of the headquarters or general business offices of the publishers:* 5618 Nebraska Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20015.
6. Names and addresses of publisher, editor, and managing editor: I. F. Stone, same address.
7. Owner *(If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual must be given):* I. F. Stone, 5618 Nebraska Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20015; Esther M. Stone, same address.
8. Known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages or other securities (If there are none, so state): none.
9. Paragraphs 7 and 8 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bonafide owner.

| | Average No. Copies Each Issue During Preceding 12 months | Single Issue Nearest To Filing Date |
|---|---|---|
| A. Total No. Copies Printed | 42,000 | 45,500 |
| B. Paid Circulation | | |
| 1. Sales Through Agents, News Dealers or Otherwise | 2,116 | 2,324 |
| 2. To Term Subscribers by Mail, Carrier Delivery, or by other means | 37,854 | 40,993 |
| C. Total Paid Circulation | 39,970 | 43,317 |
| D. Free Distribution (including samples) by Mail, Carrier Delivery, or by Other Means | 200 | 250 |
| E. Total No. of Copies Distributed | 40,170 | 43,567 |
| F. Office Use, Etc. | 1,830 | 1,933 |
| G. Total | 42,000 | 45,500 |

I certify that the statements made by me above are correct and complete. I. F. Stone, editor.


LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

**A Triumph of Greek Subtlety and U.S. Military Aid**

# The First Military Dictatorship With A Free (But Suspended) Constitution

It is easy to imagine what the U.S. would be saying if the military had seized power in Czechoslovakia, written a Constitution allowing the military junta to suspend indefinitely all basic freedoms, asked the Czechs to vote on that Constitution in an election campaign which allowed no opposition voice, held the plebiscite under martial law, and announced that 99.2 percent of the people had voted approval.

How the Kremlin must envy U.S. technological superiority in arranging such affairs! How clumsy the Kremlin's maneuvers in Czechoslovakia appear beside the smooth operations of the Colonels in Greece! The Pentagon's excuse for this extinction of liberty in Greece with U.S. arms is strategic — the need to prevent the rise of a possibly neutralist government on NATO's southern flank. The Kremlin's excuse for the Czech operation is strategic — to prevent the rise of a possibly neutralist regime, outflanking Poland to the north and Hungary to the south. But how few Americans will compare them. The remains of our Old Left is as ready to justify the extinction of liberty in Czechoslovakia as the military and the cold warriors are to justify it in Greece.

## A Deft Swindle

The Greek Colonels must be given high marks for virtuosity. The new Constitution contains all kinds of democratic guaranties — but leaves it up to the Colonels to decide when, if ever, they are to become effective. In the voting, "yes" slips were blue, "no" slips black; there was psychological conditioning in the choice of colors. The voter by dropping or refusing the blank ballots could ingratiate himself with the police and military. The two correspondents of *Le Figaro* reported (Sept. 30) they found piles of "no" ballots strewn all over the floor of the balloting places they visited. Many feared reprisals if suspected of voting wrongly.

The early returns were too good. The London *Times* (Sept. 30) carried a Frencvh Agency dispatch saying the first returns from the north of the country "showed 100 percent in favor." Alfred Friendly in the *Washington Post* (Oct. 1) indicated that the government was embarrassed and holding back early returns which "smacked too much of those traditional to dictatorships." The results from Athens were finally given as 75 percent in favor "compared with 99.8 percent in most rural areas" (*New York Times,* Oct. 1). This reduced the national average to 92.2 percent. It is hard to know how to assess these final figures since the regime did the counting.

The Colonels must be spending a fortune on propaganda. "35 foreign writers, of which five were American," the *Washington Post* reported from Athens (Sept. 29) have been brought here as guests of the regime with transportation expenses and hotel bills of them and their wives fully paid." Kingsbury Smith of the Hearst press, Wm. F. Buckley and Erwin D. Canham, editor-in-chief of the Christian Science Monitor, were among the five. "So confident was the government in the purity of its electoral process," was the way Mr. Canham admitted this in an Oct. 1 dispatch, "that it invited half a hundred news observers, myself included, to be their guests at the voting." With guest-like politeness, Mr. Canham went on to say that he had talked with leading members of the government. "They give the impression," he wrote, "of being dedicated, zealous men."

Similar VIP tours have produced similar compliments from West European parliamentarians. Two British Conservatives issued a statement on their return (London *Times,* Sept. 19) calling the military "dedicated and able" and the people, "in spite of what had been written by hostile writers, happy and relaxed." Six French deputies returned equally euphoric, according to this same story, and declared the Greek economy "wide open to foreign investments."

### Add Uses of A Lame-Duck President

**"The balance of opinion inside the Johnson Administration is tipping toward early resumption of some military aid to the military junta in Greece . . . At least since January the Pentagon has been arguing that the current military boycott is self-defeating. The State Department and White House have resisted . . . partly because of strong political opposition in Congress this election year against aid to a dictatorship. Today American officials admit that the more of a lame-duck President Johnson becomes and the closer the 90th Congress draws to its end, the less the administration has to worry about the domestic implications of resuming military aid."**

*—George Sherman,* Washington Star, *Sept. 25, who notes that while the U.S. held up supersonic planes it "has never stopped sending Greece spare parts and ammunition which, politically, are far more useful to the Greek military in maintaining internal order."*

## A Scandal in Britain

These happy tidings were interrupted Sept. 21 when a British public relations man, Maurice Fraser, obtained an injunction forbidding the London *Sunday Times* to print a document which had come into its possession. This was a report by Fraser to his employers in the military junta boasting that a British member of Parliament was on his payroll "with the object of influencing other British MPs." A week later, while the injunction was still on appeal, the *Sunday Times* said another British MP was ready to raise the issue in the House of Commons as a breach of parliamentary privilege. The *Sunday Telegraph* the same day named 10 MPs Fraser had flown to Athens with their wives on VIP tours. "During the year," the *Telegraph* added, "six German and six French MPs have also been flown to Athens, as well as numerous journalists, bankers and business men."

Freedom's frontier in the Balkans is now the world's first military dictatorship with a free constitution, and the first free constitution which provides indefinite suspension by the military dictators. To the creation of this paradox the U.S. has made no small contribution. Richard J. Barnet has just published a new book, "Intervention and Revolution." In a chapter on The Subversion of Undesirable Governments, he quotes a lovely remark by Hubert Humphrey in a happier day during a Senate investigation of the Iranian aid program in 1957. "Do you know what the head of the Iranian army told one of our people?" Humphrey asked. "He said the army was in good shape, thanks to U.S. aid — it was now capable of coping with the civilian population." The same prowess, due to the same aid, is now on display in Greece.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# The Lull Is Over and Hard Fighting Lies Ahead

*(Continued from Page One)*

that Humphrey or Nixon are any readier for it than he is.

## The Meaning of the Wiggins Appointment

Humphrey repeated that stupefying nonsense about how on March 31 Johnson "sacrificed his own political career in order to bring negotiations that could lead to peace." Every day makes clearer that just the opposite is the case. Johnson freed himself from the pressures of politics in order to carry on the war. His line has hardened. His latest appointment of a U.S. representative to the UN shows he no longer bothers to try and fool public opinion at home and abroad by naming men like Goldberg or Ball who are or appear to be doves. Goldberg was himself the victim of Johnson; he really thought the President wanted peace when he stepped down from the Court to go to the UN. Ball's reputation as a dove has always been overblown, and his attack on U Thant for advocating an end of the bombing showed how little reality there was behind the gossip that he was the dove-in-residence of the State Department. I myself never thought his dissent on the war much more than a reflection of his fear that we were paying too much attention to Asia at the expense of his old clients in the Common Market. But of his successor, Russell Wiggins, there is no doubt. Though a liberal in domestic affairs, Wiggins made the editorial page of the *Washington Post* a faithful echo of the Johnson-Rusk line on Vietnam. Johnson no longer needs to pretend.

I am just back from a few days in Paris where I had a look at the stalemated Paris peace talks. For the newsmen, it is like covering a glacier, except that glaciers sometimes move an inch or so a year. The line of the other side seems to have hardened with our own. There is less emphasis on the *Alliance* as a bridge to the South Vietnamese middle class and a political compromise; the NLF is back in the center of discussion. Apparently Hanoi was preparing last March to make so explicit an offer on peace talks if the bombing ended as to put Washington squarely on the spot. Johnson outflanked Hanoi by making his own offer of a limited bombing pause first. It was a skilful ploy, not a serious proposal, and Washington was surprised when Hanoi accepted it. My impression is that Hanoi did so because of pressure from its own allies. My impression from our own side is that the reason we do not stop the bombing altogether and begin substantive talks is because we have no real negotiating position ready except a Korean solution, i.e. the surrender of the other side. There is a lot more fighting ahead before serious negotiations can be envisaged. The lull is over and the NLF spokesmen elude a quiet confidence.

The outlook is bleak. In South Vietnam, the jails are full of Buddhists and of other non-Communist peace elements. At home it is as foolish to rely on Nixon for peace as on Humphrey. Johnson has already shown what he thinks of Humphrey in arranging for Marvin Watson to campaign for him. At lunch in Paris some North Vietnamese asked me to explain the election and the two-party system. I said it was a triumph of the dialectic. It showed that two could be one and one could be two, and had probably been fabricated by Hegel for the American market on a subcontract from General Dynamics. The North Vietnamese are Marxists with a sense of humor, but none of us were really laughing.

### Footnote on Humphrey's Liberalism

**A sour footnote to the Humphrey campaign is being written in Minnesota where the State's Attorney General ruled the Communist Party's presidential candidate off the ballot on the ground that the party had been outlawed by the Anti-Communist Control Act of 1954. The outlawry provisions were fathered by Humphrey, Morse and a group of Senate liberals anxious to prove they were not "soft on Communism." The Justice Department, to its credit, is siding with the Communists. In a brief amicus, U.S. Attorney Patrick Foley warned that the Act "raises problems", i.e. may be unconstitutional, as a breach of the First Amendment. The Justice Department advises the Court to avoid the issue by holding that the outlawry provisions apply only to the Party and not to individuals! We sympathize with the American Civil Liberties Union which wants the court to meet the issue and strike the provisions down as unconstitutional. As a postscript we note that the 1954 amendments were to the Internal Security Act of 1950 which Nixon fathered. What a pair!**

**This Is The Time to Send A Gift Sub to That Youngster Going Off to College**

**FOR STONE'S NEW BOOK**

For the enclosed $6.95 send I. F. Stone's new book, In A Time of Torment (Random House) regular price $7.95

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

*Indicate if gift announcement wished* ☐

**Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:**

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

**I. F. Stone's Weekly** 10/7/68

**5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. 20015**

*I. F. Stone's Weekly*

**5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.**
**Washington, D. C. 20015**

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every other Monday at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED